UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/730,987	12/06/2000	Geoffrey L. Turner	091451.00500	8191

34802   7590   07/08/2008
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP
ATTN: STEFAN V. STEIN/ IP DEPT.
POST OFFICE BOX 1288
TAMPA, FL 33601-1288

EXAMINER
SPOONER, LAMONT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _01 April 2008_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-12,14-30,32-48,50-66 and 68-74_ is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-12,14-30,32-48,50-66 and 68-74_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _11 August 2005_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
      Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
      Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1.   This office action is in response to applicant's arguments filed 4/1/08.

Claims 1-12, 14-30, 32-48, 50-66, and 68-74 are currently pending and

have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 3/17/06 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

3.   In response to applicant's arguments, "[T]o recite that the

replacement language database structure provides a one-to-one mapping

of preferred languages to replacement languages, whereby a preferred

language has a single replacement language that the system will look to if

there is not an available descriptor in the preferred language. Fujita's

reliance on language families does not disclose a separate database

structure configured for determining an individual replacement language.

Specifically, under Fujita's approach, if a replacement descriptor is not

available in the Spanish language, Fujita will pick a replacement language

from another Romanic Language." Wherein applicant is arguing that Fujita

does not map a single replacement language to a corresponding

replacement language, the Examiner cannot concur wherein Fujita

provides three explicit embodiments for a replacement language structure,

one being a one-to-one mapping, see C.7 lines 52-51-his specified

language display of untranslated words. Furthermore, Fujita maps a

replacement language to a preferred language, despite the language family

that is present; there is still a mapping of a replacement language to a

single language that takes place. In other words, Fujita contains a database

structure that maps a single replacement language to a corresponding

preferred language, and also contains a language family, replacement

means, which is not in anyway distinguishable as currently claimed by

applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the

basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-20, 22-30, 32-38, 40-48, 50-54, and 72 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herbert, III

(herein referred to as Herbert, US Patent No. 6,018,742 Jan. 25, 2000) in

view of Fujita (US 5,612,872).

As per **claim 1**, Herbert discloses a computer readable medium

comprising a language database structure, comprising:

a descriptor database structure including at least one descriptor (Fig.

22-the ID 1000), at least one descriptor value for each descriptor wherein

each descriptor value is expressed in a language (Fig. 22 Hammers, Pliers,

Nails), and a language identifier for each descriptor value wherein the

language identifier identifies the language (Fig. 22 English, Spanish,

French),

a preferred language identifier for identifying a user's preferred

language based on information relating to the user (Fig. 22 item 248).

but lacks explicitly:

a replacement language database structure mapping a single

replacement language which serves as substitute to the corresponding

preferred language when the descriptor does not have the descriptor value

in the user's preferred language such that a descriptor value is needed for

generating a language-specific output structure.

However, Fujita teaches a replacement language database structure

mapping a single replacement language which serves as substitute to the

…generating a language-specific output structure (C.7 lines 52-51-his

specified language display of untranslated words, see also, Fig. 15,

C.9.lines 15-31-evidenced by the substitute for the preferred language

when the values is missing, wherein the value is necessary for generating

the output, C.5.lines 12-17, Fig. 9 and C.6.line 6-part of his structure).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to

modify Herbert by having a replacement language for his preferred

language. The motivation for doing so would have been to have a word

without a preferred language translation, provided in a language more

easily understood (C.4.lines 4-10).

As per **claim 2**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations

of claim 1, upon which claim 2 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the language identifier is selected from the group consisting of a

language name and a language symbol (Fig. 22 "English", 129, Fig. 23,

Language_ID column, Fig. 24, Lang_ID, Lang_Name).

As per **claim 3**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations

of claim 1, upon which claim 3 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the language identifier is a language pointer (C.11.lines 42-46,

C.12.lines 9-59-language identifier points to language record containing

relevant language information).

As per **claim 5**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations

of claim 1, upon which claim 5 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the at least one descriptor, the at least one descriptor value for each

descriptor, and the language identifier for each descriptor value are stored

in a table (Fig. 22).

As per **claim 6**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations

of claim 1, upon which claim 6 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the at least one descriptor and the at least one descriptor value for

each descriptor are stored in a first table (Fig. 22 items 240, 244, 238, Fig.

22. items 246, and 232), and wherein the at least one descriptor value for

each descriptor and the language identifier for each descriptor value are

stored in a second table (Fig. 22 items 246, 248).

As per **claim 7**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations

of claim 1, upon which claim 7 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the descriptor database structure comprises a table having a name

that includes the language identifier, wherein descriptors and associated

descriptor values expressed in the language are stored in the table, and

wherein the table does not include a descriptor value expressed in another

language that differs from the language (Fig. 22 each row table in item 242,

row 1 columns 246, 248, 232, 234, 236, C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1, 2

"Each record is stored in a row of a respective table object, 30, and each

field of that record is assigned to an appropriate column.", C.12.lines 25-40-

each record does not include a descriptor value expressed in another

language that differs from the language).

As per **claim 8**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations

of claim 1, upon which claim 8 depends. Herbert further discloses:

a user database structure including at least one user identifier which

identifies a user (Fig. 23 item 250).

As per **claim 9**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations

of claim 1, upon which claim 9 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the preferred language identifier is selected from the group consisting

of a preferred language name and a preferred language symbol (Fig. 23,

Fig. 24, C.12.lines 53-59).

As per **claim 10**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 10 depends. Herbert further

discloses:

the preferred language identifier is a preferred language pointer

(C.12.lines 55-59).

As per **claim 11**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 10, upon which claim 11 depends. Herbert further

discloses:

the preferred language pointer points to the preferred language

(C.12.lines 55-59-retrieving a language appropriate record).

As per **claim 12**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 10, upon which claim 12 depends. Herbert further

discloses:

the preferred language pointer points to an algorithm which

automatically determines the preferred language (Figs. 26, and 27-the

algorithm for performing the program steps) based on stored information

about a user and further wherein said stored information does not include

the user's preferred language (C.14.lines 1-6-his geographical context

identifier interpreted to identify user's preferred language-see context

dependent discussion-C.15.lines 16-C.16.line 24, C.17.lines 10-14-France,

Germany…French and German).

As per **claim 14**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 14 depends. Herbert further

discloses:

an application database structure which includes: at least one output

descriptor, wherein each output descriptor appears as a descriptor within

the descriptor database structure (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23-unique

fields, and numbers describing the fields located in the database); and an

output zone of an output medium associated with each output descriptor

(C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and

interface has unique column rows and fields identified by an output

descriptor).

As per **claim 15**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 14, upon which claim 15 depends. Herbert further

discloses:

the output medium includes a screen display, and wherein each

output zone identifies a portion of the screen display (C.4.lines 63-67,

C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique

column rows and fields).

As per **claim 16**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 15, upon which claim 16 depends. Herbert further

discloses:

each output descriptor is of an output type selected from the group

consisting of a screen title, a prompt, a help text, an error message, an

instruction message, and an informational message (Fig. 3-output views,

Figs. 4, 8, 10a, 22-output type includes informational message).

As per **claim 17**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 14, upon which claim 17 depends. Herbert further

discloses:

wherein the output medium includes a printed page, and wherein

each output zone identifies a portion of the printed page (C.16.lines 34-39-

the output medium is a printed page of the output, which includes the

output zones as indicated previously).

As per **claims 18 and 36**, Herbert discloses a computer-implemented

method of generating a language-specific output structure on an output

medium, comprising the steps of:

providing a descriptor database structure including at least one

descriptor (Fig. 22-the ID 1000), at least one descriptor value for each

descriptor wherein each descriptor value is expressed in a language (Fig.

22 Hammers, Pliers, Nails), and a language identifier for each descriptor

value wherein the language identifier identifies the language (Fig. 22

English, Spanish, French);

determining a user identifier of a user (Fig. 22 item 248, Fig. 23);

identifying a preferred language based on the user identifier (Fig. 22

item 248, Fig. 23);

determining at least one output descriptor and associating with each

output descriptor an output zone of the output medium (C.4.lines 63-67,

C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique

column rows and fields identified by an output descriptor), wherein each

output descriptor appears as a descriptor within the descriptor database

structure (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23-unique fields, and numbers

describing the fields located in the database);

generating a descriptor value for each output descriptor, by utilizing

the preferred language and the descriptor database structure if a descriptor

value for a preferred language exists (Fig. 22, C.12.lines 25-67, C.13.lines

1-10-each unique output descriptor value for each output descriptor is generated by the preferred or user identified preferred language and descriptor database structure); and

transferring the descriptor value for each output descriptor to the associated output zone of the output medium (Fig. 22 item 242, C.12.lines 40-65-the view, including the output zone of the output medium, includes the descriptor value for each output descriptor as described previously), but lacks explicitly:

providing a replacement language database structure, wherein said language database structure includes a single replacement language which serves as replacement for a corresponding preferred language

generating a descriptor value by utilizing said replacement language for an output descriptor where no descriptor value exists for the preferred language with the replacement language being a predefined function of the preferred language

However, Fujita teaches a replacement language database structure, wherein said language database structure includes a single replacement language which serves as replacement for a corresponding preferred language and generating a descriptor value by utilizing said replacement

language for an output descriptor where no descriptor value exists for the

preferred language, with the replacement language being a redefined

function of the preferred language (see claim 1, c.7 discussion, Fig. 15,

C.9.lines 15-31,evidenced by the word being a predefined function of the

preferred language, as seen by Fujita's "Specified Language Chosen by

Input of Indication Information mode" wherein the substitute/replacement

language is a function of the preferred language by family relation. Thus

the function is defined by his specified language and preferred language, or

initial desired language of output., C.5.lines 12-17, Fig. 9 and C.6.line 6-

part of his structure). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have

been obvious to modify Herbert by having a replacement language. The

motivation for doing so would have been to have a word without a preferred

language translation, provided in a language more easily understood

(C.4.lines 4-10).

As per **claim 19 and 37**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 19 depends. Herbert further

discloses:

the language identifier is selected from the group consisting of a

language name and a language symbol (Fig. 22 "English", 129, Fig. 23,

Language_ID column, Fig. 24, Lang_ID, Lang_Name).

As per **claim 20 and 38**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 20 depends. Herbert further

discloses:

the language identifier is a language pointer (C.11.lines 42-46,

C.12.lines 9-59-language identifier points to language record containing

relevant language information).

As per **claim 22 and 40**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 22 depends. Herbert further

discloses:

the step of providing a descriptor database structure comprises

providing a table which includes the at least one descriptor (Fig. 22 items

246), the at least one descriptor value for each descriptor (Fig. 22 item

232), and the language identifier for each descriptor value (Fig. 22 item

248).

As per **claim 23 and 41**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 23 depends. Herbert further discloses the step of providing a descriptor database structure comprises:

providing a first table which includes the at least one descriptor and the at least one descriptor value for each descriptor (Fig. 22 items 246, items 232); and

providing a second table which includes the at least one descriptor value for each descriptor and the language identifier for each descriptor value (Fig. 22 items 248, 232, 234, 236).

As per **claims 24 and 42**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 24 depends. Herbert further discloses:

the step of providing a descriptor database structure comprises providing a table having a name that includes the language identifier (Fig. 22 row table- "129 (English)"), wherein the table includes the descriptors and the associated descriptor values which are expressed in the language (Fig. 22 descriptor 1000, 1001, descriptor values Hammers, Pliers), and wherein the table does not include a descriptor value expressed in another language that differs from the language (Fig. 22 each row table in item 242,

row 1 columns 246, 248, 232, 234, 236, C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1, 2

"Each record is stored in a row of a respective table object, 30, and each

field of that record is assigned to an appropriate column.", C.12.lines 25-40-

each record does not include a descriptor value expressed in another

language that differs from the language).

As per **claims 25 and 43**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 25 depends. Herbert further

discloses:

the step of determining a user identifier includes prompting the user

for information from which the user identifier may be ascertained (Fig. 23,

C.14.lines 12-15).

As per **claims 26 and 44**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 26 depends. Herbert further

discloses:

the step of identifying a preferred language comprises identifying a

preferred language identifier from a user database structure, said preferred

language identifier being used to identify the preferred language, and said

user database structure including (C.12.lines 40-67):

a list of user identifiers, said list including the user identifier of the

user (Fig. 23); and

a preferred language identifier associated with each user identifier

(Fig. 23).

As per **claims 27 and 45**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 26, upon which claim 27 depends. Herbert further

discloses:

the preferred language identifier is selected from the group consisting

of a preferred language name and a preferred language symbol (Fig. 23,

Fig. 24, C.12.lines 40-67, C.13.lines 1-27).

As per **claims 28 and 46**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 26, upon which claim 28 depends. Herbert further

discloses:

the preferred language identifier includes a preferred language

pointer (C.12.lines 55-59).

As per **claims 29 and 47**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 28, upon which claim 29 depends. Herbert further

discloses:

the preferred language pointer points to the preferred language (Fig.

22, Fig 23, Fig. 24, C.12.lines 55-59, C.13.lines 1-27-the pointer points to

the preferred language location for information retrieval).

As per **claims 30 and 48**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 28, upon which claim 30 depends. Herbert further

discloses:

the preferred language pointer points to an algorithm automatically

determines the preferred language (Figs. 26, and 27-the algorithm for

performing the program steps) based on stored information about a user

and further wherein said stored information does not include the user's

preferred language (C.14.lines 1-6-his geographical context identifier

interpreted to identify user's preferred language-see context dependent

discussion-C.15.lines 16-C.16.line 24, C.17.lines 10-14-France,

Germany...French and German).

As per **claims 32 and 50**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 32 depends. Herbert further

discloses:

the step of determining at least one output descriptor and associating

with each output descriptor an output zone of the output medium comprises

providing an

application database structure which includes (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-

23-unique fields, and numbers describing the fields located in the

database, C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen

and interface has unique column rows and fields identified by an output

descriptor):

the at least one output descriptor, wherein each output descriptor

appears as a descriptor within the descriptor database structure (C.4.lines

63-67, C.5.lines 1-23-unique fields, and numbers describing the fields

located in the database); and

the output zone of the output medium associated with each output

descriptor (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen

and interface has unique column rows and fields identified by an output

descriptor).

As per **claims 33 and 51**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 33 depends. Herbert further

discloses:

the output medium includes a screen display, and wherein each output zone identifies a portion of the screen display (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique column rows and fields).

As per **claims 34 and 52**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 33, upon which claim 34 depends. Herbert further discloses:

each output descriptor is of an output type selected from the group consisting of a screen title, a prompt, a help text, an error message, an instruction message, and an informational message (Fig. 3-output views, Figs. 4, 8, 10a, 22-output type includes informational message).

As per **claims 35 and 53**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 35 depends. Herbert further discloses:

wherein the output medium includes a printed page, and wherein each output zone identifies a portion of the printed page (C.16.lines 34-39-the output medium is a printed page of the output, which includes the output zones as indicated previously).

As per **claims 54**, Herbert discloses a computer system for generating a language-specific output structure on an output medium, comprising:

a processor; a memory device; an input device coupled to the processor; an output device coupled to the processor; a language database structure coupled to the processor; and a computer code located on the memory device (Fig. 29, C.16.lines 27-67, C.17.lines 1-14),

wherein the output device includes the output medium (Fig. 29 item 514, C.16.lines 34-41),

wherein the processor executes the computer code (C.16.lines 56-65),

wherein the language database structure includes a descriptor database structure (C.16.lines 27-67, C.17.lines 1-14, Fig. 22),

wherein the descriptor database structure includes at least one descriptor (Fig. 22 item 246), at least one descriptor value for each descriptor such that each descriptor value is expressed in a language (Fig. 22 item 232), and a language identifier for each descriptor value such that the language identifier identifies the language (Fig. 22 item 248), and

wherein the computer code comprises an algorithm which includes:

determining a user identifier of a user (Fig. 22, 23, C.14.lines

10-14);

identifying a preferred language based on the user identifier

(C.14.lines 10-14);

determining at least one output descriptor and associating with each

output descriptor an output zone of the output medium (C.4.lines 63-67,

C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique

column rows and fields identified by an output descriptor), wherein each

output descriptor appears as a descriptor within the descriptor database

structure (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23-unique fields, and numbers

describing the fields located in the database);

generating a descriptor value for each output descriptor, by utilizing

the preferred language and the descriptor database structure if a descriptor

value for the preferred language exists (Fig. 22, C.12.lines 25-67,

C.13.lines 1-10-each unique output descriptor value for each output

descriptor is generated by the preferred or user identified preferred

language and descriptor database structure); and

transferring the descriptor value for each output descriptor to the

associated output zone of the output medium (Fig. 22 item 242, C.12.lines

40-65-the view, including the output zone of the output medium, includes

the descriptor value for each output descriptor as described previously) but

lacks explicitly:

a replacement language database structure includes a single

replacement language which serves as substitute for the corresponding

preferred language when the descriptor does not have the descriptor value

in the user's preferred language such that a descriptor value is needed for

generating a language-specific output structure, generating a descriptor

value by utilizing said replacement language for an output descriptor where

no descriptor value exists for the preferred language.

However, Fujita teaches a replacement language database structure

including a single replacement language...generating a language-specific

output structure (see claim 1, C.7 discussion, Fig. 15, C.9.lines 15-31-

evidenced by the substitute for the preferred language when the values is

missing, wherein the value is necessary for generating the output, C.5.lines

12-17, Fig. 9 and C.6.line 6-part of his structure)

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to

modify Herbert by having a replacement language. The motivation for doing

so would have been to have a word without a preferred language

translation, provided in a language more easily understood (C.4.lines 4-10).

.As per **claim 72**, Herbert discloses a computer program product,

comprising:

a computer usable medium having a computer readable program

code embodied therein for generating a language-specific output structure

on an output medium (C.16.lines 27-65, C.17.lines 1-14),

wherein the computer readable program code comprises an algorithm

which utilizes a language database structure(C.16.lines 56-65),

wherein the language database structure includes a descriptor

database structure (Fig. 22, item 246),

wherein the descriptor database structure includes at least one

descriptor (Fig. 22 item 246), at least one descriptor value for each

descriptor such that each descriptor value is expressed in a language (Fig.

22 item 232), and a language identifier for each descriptor value such that

the language identifier identifies the language (Fig. 22 item 248), and

wherein the algorithm includes:

determining a user identifier of a user (Fig. 22, 23, C.14.lines

10-14);

identifying a preferred language based on the user identifier

(C.14.lines 10-14);

determining at least one output descriptor and associating with each

output descriptor an output zone of the output medium (C.4.lines 63-67,

C.5.lines 1-23, C.9.lines 1-43,-the view screen and interface has unique

column rows and fields identified by an output descriptor), wherein each

output descriptor appears as a descriptor within the descriptor database

structure (C.4.lines 63-67, C.5.lines 1-23-unique fields, and numbers

describing the fields located in the database);

generating a descriptor value for each output descriptor, by utilizing

the preferred language and the descriptor database structure if a descriptor

value for a preferred language exists (Fig. 22, C.12.lines 25-67, C.13.lines

1-10-each unique output descriptor value for each output descriptor is

generated by the preferred or user identified preferred language and

descriptor database structure); and

transferring the descriptor value for each output descriptor to the

associated output zone of the output medium (Fig. 22 item 242, C.12.lines

40-65-the view, including the output zone of the output medium, includes

the descriptor value for each output descriptor as described previously) but

lacks explicitly:

a replacement language database structure includes a single

replacement language which serves as substitute for the corresponding

preferred language when the descriptor does not have the descriptor value

in the user's preferred language such that a descriptor value is needed for

generating a language-specific output structure, generating a descriptor

value by utilizing said replacement language for an output descriptor where

no descriptor value exists for the preferred language.

However, Fujita teaches a replacement language database structure

including a single replacement language…generating a language-specific

output structure (see claim 1, c.7 discussion, Fig. 15, C.9.lines 15-31-

evidenced by the substitute for the preferred language when the values is

missing, wherein the value is necessary for generating the output, C.5.lines

12-17, Fig. 9 and C.6.line 6-part of his structure).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to

modify Herbert by having a replacement language. The motivation for doing

so would have been to have a word without a preferred language

translation, provided in a language more easily understood (C.4.lines 4-10).

6.   Claims 4, 21, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Herbert in view of Fujita and further in view of Malatesta

et al. (herein referred to as Malatesta, US Patent No. 5,442,782 Aug. 15,

1995).

As per **claim 4**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the limitations

of claim 1, upon which claim 4 depends. Herbert further discloses a first

descriptor of the at least one descriptor has N.sub.1 descriptor values (Fig.

22-descriptor 1000 contains the descriptor values, HAMMERS, MARTILLO,

MARTEAU), wherein a second descriptor of the at least one descriptor has

N.sub.2 descriptor values (Fig. 22-descriptor 1001 contains the descriptor

values-PLIERS, ALICATES, PINCES), but the combination lacks disclosing

N.sub.1 is unequal to N.sub.2.

However, Malatesta teaches (Fig. 3 item 336, C.4.lines 43-49)

N.sub.1. is unequal to N.sub.2. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it

would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify

Herbert by not requiring including an equal amount of descriptor values for

each descriptor. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide

recourse for when a related language record does not exist (C.4.lines 43-

49).

As per **claim 21 and 39**, Herbert and Fujita make obvious all of the

limitations of claim 18, upon which claim 21 depends. Herbert further

discloses a first descriptor of the at least one descriptor has N.sub.1

descriptor values (Fig. 22-descriptor 1000 contains the descriptor values,

HAMMERS, MARTILLO, MARTEAU), wherein a second descriptor of the at

least one descriptor has N.sub.2 descriptor values (Fig. 22-descriptor 1001

contains the descriptor values-PLIERS, ALICATES, PINCES), but the

combination lacks disclosing N.sub.1 is unequal to N.sub.2.

However, Malatesta teaches (Fig. 3 item 336, C.4.lines 43-49)

N.sub.1. is unequal to N.sub.2. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it

would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify

Herbert by not requiring including an equal amount of descriptor values for

each descriptor. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide

recourse for when a related language record does not exist (C.4.lines 43-

49).

7.   **Claims 55-66, and 68-71** fall within the scope of the previously

rejected claims 1-53, and therefore are rejected by the same reasons.

8.   **Claims 73 and 74**, fall within the scope of the previously rejected

claims 1-53, and therefore are rejected by the same reasons.

Conclusion

9.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection

presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE**

FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of

time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to

expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a

first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final

action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the

THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory

period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the

mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory

period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final

action.

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications

from the examiner should be directed to LAMONT M. SPOONER whose

telephone number is (571)272-7613. The examiner can normally be

reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571/272-7603.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained

from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status

information for published applications may be obtained from either Private

PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is

available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center

(EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-

1000.

lms
7/2/08
/Patrick N. Edouard/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626